

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include the addition of the legend "Prior Art" to Figures 4-17. The attached "Replacement Sheets" for sheets 2/17 through 8/17 include Figures 4-17 and replace the original sheets 2/17 through 8/17 including Figures 4-17.

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-22 are now pending in the application (Claims 9-22 have been withdrawn from further consideration). The subject matter of Claim 2 has been incorporated into Claim 1 and Claim 2 has been cancelled herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have enclosed Replacement Sheets 2/17 through 8/17 (including Figures 4-17) for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets, the Applicants have amended Figures 4-17 by labelling these figures as "Prior Art" in accordance with U.S. patent practice.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Specifically, the Abstract of the disclosure is objected to due to its length and form. Applicants have amended the Abstract in order to overcome the objection to the Abstract's length and form. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection to the Abstract is respectfully requested.

The title of the invention is objected to as not being descriptive. Applicants respectfully assert that the title is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection to the title is respectfully requested.

Further, although Applicants note the Examiner's request for cooperation in correcting any errors of which Applicants may become aware in the Specification, Applicants have not become aware of any errors requiring correction. Applicants will, however, continue to cooperate in the correction of any errors in the Specification.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102; FRIEND

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Friend (U.S. Pat. No. 6,580,212). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites "wherein the electroluminescent layer in its part around the boundary between the electroluminescent layer and the protrusion is in contact with the protrusion in such a state that the electroluminescent layer is curved in section in a direction opposite to the convexly curved protrusion." This language was previously present in Claim 2. Applicants respectfully assert that Friend does not disclose or suggest Applicants' invention as recited in Claim 1 (as indicated by the fact that this rejection does not include Claim 2). Since each of the remaining claims (Claims 4, 6, 7, and 8) depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are likewise patentable for at least the reason discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102; LEE

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0098645 to Lee et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As indicated above, Claim 1 recites "wherein the electroluminescent layer in its part around the boundary between the electroluminescent layer and the protrusion is in contact with the protrusion in such a state that the electroluminescent layer is curved in section in a direction opposite to the convexly curved protrusion." This feature is illustrated, for example, in Figures 1-3 of the present application. Specifically, in these figures the EL layer 5 in its part around the boundary between the EL layer 5 and the protrusions (partition wall 4) is in contact with the protrusions (partition wall 4) in such a state that the EL layer 5 is curved in section in a direction opposite to the convexly curved protrusions (partition wall 4). This can be seen, for example, at part 1000 in Figure 2 and part 1001 in Figure 3 of the instant application. Furthermore, the oppositely, convexly curved portions at the two ends of EL layer 5 can reduce or eliminate the prior art problem which is caused by electrode breaking and makes it difficult to realize even the thickness of an EL layer can be solved. The present specification refers to the prior art problem at page 3, lines 23 and page 5, lines 30 to 35. The claimed structure can have the beneficial effect as demonstrated in Examples A1 to A3.

This restriction points to Figure 2 and column 3, sections [0049] and [0050] and asserts that "the organic EL layered 290 in its part around the boundary between the EL

layer and the protusion is in contact with the protusion so that the EL layer is curved in a direction opposite to the convexly curved protusion." In actually, however, this assertion is unsupported by the cited portions of Lee et al. All convexly curved portions face the same direction in Lee et al. In addition, the two ends of the organic EL layer 290 of Lee et al. does not have the possibility to solve the problems of the prior art.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Lee et al. does not disclose or substrate Applicants' invention as defined by Claim 1. Since the remaining claims (Claims 2-5) depend from Claim 1, either directly or indirectly, Applicants respectfully assert that they are likewise patentable for at least the same reason discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 14, 2005

By: 
Michael E. Hifton, Reg. No. 33,509

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MEH/cs